

**Decision for DOI-BLM- NM- P010- 2010- 67 - DNA**

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the Roswell Resource Management Plan, as amended, and was analyzed in EA-NM-060-00-084.

If you wish to protest this proposed decision in accordance with 43 CFR 4160.2, you are allowed 15 days to do so in person or in writing to the authorized officer, after the receipt of this decision. Please be specific in your points of protest.

The protest shall be filed with the Field Manager, Bureau of Land Management, 2909 West 2<sup>nd</sup>, Roswell, NM 88201. This protest should specify, clearly and concisely, why you think the proposed action is in error.


In the absence of a protest within the time allowed, the above decision shall constitute my final decision. Should this notice become the final decision, you are allowed an additional 30 days within which to file an appeal for the purpose of a hearing before the Interior Board of Land Appeals, and to petition for stay of the decision pending final determination on the appeal (43 CFR 4.21 and 4.410). If a petition for stay is not requested and granted, the decision will be put into effect following the 30-day appeal period. The appeal and petition for stay should be filed with the Field Manager at the above address. The appeal should specify, clearly and concisely, why you think the decision is in error. The petition for stay should specify how you will be harmed if the stay is not granted.

/s/ J H Parman  
J H Parman  
Acting Assistant Field Manager

6/9/10  
Date



# Allotment 64012



0 0.25 0.5 1 1.5 Miles

No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data for individual use or aggregate use with other data, or for the purposes not intended by BLM. Spatial information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This information may be updated without notification.

**U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Pecos District  
Roswell Field Office**

**Documentation of Land Use Plan Compliance  
and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

**DOI-BLM- NM- P010- 2010- 67 - DNA**

A. Roswell Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: Allotment 64012

Proposed Action Title/Type: 10 year grazing lease

Location of Proposed Action: Allotment #64012 is located in Chaves county,  
approximately 30 miles northwest of Roswell, New Mexico.

Description of Proposed Action: Renew the 10 year grazing lease for Allotment #64012

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Roswell Resource Management Plan

Date Approved: October 1997

LUP Name: New Mexico Standards for Rangeland Health & Guidelines for Livestock Grazing  
Management

Date Approved: January 2001

LUP Name: Special Status Species RMP Amendment

Date Approved: May 2008

Other document: EA-NM-060-00-084

Date Approved March 2000

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically  
provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Roswell Resource Management Plan

Date Approved: October 1997

New Mexico Standards for Rangeland Health & Guidelines for Livestock Grazing  
Management

Date Approved: January 2001

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related  
documents that cover the proposed action.

EA-NM-060-00-084

Date Approved March 2000

#### D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Yes. The current Proposed Action was analyzed in the above mentioned Environmental Assessment (EA). The proposed action is the same action analyzed in the existing NEPA document.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Yes. The existing NEPA documents analyzed the proposed action as well as a reasonable range of alternatives. The EA was reviewed by identified public interests and no conflicts or concerns were identified. The same applies to the current proposed action given current concerns, interests, and resource values.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Yes. The proposed action is the same as the proposed action as analyzed in the EA. The EA was recently completed and there is no new information or circumstances in regard to this allotment which would warrant further analysis. In support to the existing document a Rangeland Health Assessment was conducted in January of 2010. In the Rangeland Health Assessment it was found that both Upland and Biotic Indicators, "meets" the standards of Rangeland health.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document? [Document and explain]

Yes, the direct, indirect and cumulative effects would be the same as stated in the existing NEPA document. The effects would not be changed considering the proposed action is the same as the proposed action as analyzed in the EA, along with no change in management.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Kyle Arnold

J. Howard Parman

Rangeland Management specialist-BLM-RFO

NEPA Planning Coordinator-BLM-RFO

Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

**Conclusion:**

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kyle Arnold  
Project Lead

\_\_\_\_\_  
03-05-2010  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
J H Parman  
Acting Assistant Field Manager-Resources

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Bureau of Land Management, Roswell Field Office**  
**Environmental Assessment Checklist DOI-BLM- NM- P010- 2010- 67 - DNA**

Resources	Not Present on Site	No Impacts	May Be Impacts	Mitigation Included	BLM Reviewer	Date
Air Quality			X	X	SWA Spec/Hydro. /s/ Michael McGee	4/12/2010
Soil			X	X		
Watershed Hydrology			X	X		
Floodplains	X					
Water Quality - Surface			X	X		
Water Quality - Ground			X	X	Geologist/Hydrologist /s/ Michael McGee	4/12/2010
Cultural Resources		X			/s/Rebecca L. Hill	15Mar2010
Native American Religious Concerns	X				Archaeologist	
Paleontology	X					
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	X				/s/J H Parman Plan & Env. Coord.	3/23/10
Farmlands, Prime or Unique		X			Realty /s/Tate Salas	3/24/10
Rights-of-Way		X				
Invasive, Non-native Species		X			/s/Kyle Arnold Range Mgmt. Spec.	03/31/2010
Vegetation			X	X		
Livestock Grazing			X	X		
Wastes, Hazardous or Solid		X			/s/ Jared Reese Nat. Resource Spec.	3/29/2010
Threatened or Endangered Species	X				/s/ Dbaggao Biologist	3/31/10
Special Status Species	X					
Wildlife			X	X		
Wetlands/Riparian Zones	X					
Wild and Scenic Rivers	X				/s/Bill Murry Outdoor Rec. Plnr.	3/22/10
Wilderness	X					
Recreation		X				
Visual Resources		X				
Cave/Karst		X				
Environmental Justice	X				/s/ Jared Reese Nat. Resource Spec.	3/12/2010
Public Health and Safety		X				
Solid Mineral Resources		√			/s/ Jerry Dutchover Geo/SPS	03/17/10
Fluid Mineral Resources		X			?s/ John S. Simitz Geologist	03/24/2010